

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/672,521	09/26/2003	Toru Takayama	0553-0193.01	1175		
7590 11/22/2005			EXAMINER			
Edward D. Manzo			NGUYEN, HA T			
Cook, Alex, M Cummings & N	cFarron, Manzo, Mehler. Ltd.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	ns St. Ste. 2850	2812				
Chicago, IL	50606		DATE MAILED: 11/22/200	DATE MAILED: 11/22/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/672,521	TAKAYAMA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Ha T. Nguyen	2812	
	10/672,521 Examiner	10/672,521 TAKAYAMA ET AL. Examiner Art Unit

		na i. Nguyeii		2012		
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover shee	et with the c	orrespondence add	ress	
THE	REPLY FILED 09 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CO	NDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.		
1. 🗵	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an ame tice of Appeal (with app	endment, aff peal fee) in o	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3)	
	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			•		
b)	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76	ater than SIX MONTHS from (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b)	om the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.	
have unde set fo may	nsions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exit of TSP 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sunth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) ICE OF APPEAL	tension and the correspon shortened statutory period than three months after the	iding amount for reply origi	of the fee. The appropring the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as	
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed NDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR	41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th		
3.	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beloc) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or sear w);	rch (see NO	TE below);		
(0	appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a entire NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	•				
4. [_ 5. [_	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		e of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment ((PTOL-324).	
6. 🗀	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		a separate,	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the	
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
	Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	٠.				
AFFI	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. □	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections	under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a	
	☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the cla	aims after ei	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
11. [The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see attached.	t does NOT place the a	application in	condition for allowar	nce because:	
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-14	49) Paper N	lo(s)		
				Ha Nguyen 11-21-5		

Response to Amendment

Applicants' arguments with regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been fully considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive for at least the following reasons.

Applicants mainly argued that Oikawa et al. (USPN 4619695, hereinafter "Oikawa") does not disclose an amount of Na contained within the wiring is 0.3 ppm or less, but it only discloses the concentration of Na in the target, that is not the same as the concentration of Na in the wiring. This is true however Oikawa also discloses that the purity of the deposited film is governed by the purity of the target (see col. 2, lines 4-12). Oikawa recognizes the problem disclosed by the claimed invention and offers a solution. With the concentration of Na in the target to be less 100ppb (0.1ppm) (see col. 3, lines 51-59) when the film is deposited even with variation caused by the sputtering process at least there is still an overlapping range of Na concentration between the wiring of Oikawa with the claimed invention. Considering the difference in the instant specification, as argued by applicants, the examiner found that Oikawa uses the target with the same high purity as applicant's claimed invention, inherently similar results would be obtained. Therefore, the combined teaching of the applied references does teach or make obvious all the limitations of the rejected claims 26-45.

The final rejection of claims 26-45 should be sustained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ha T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30AM to 6:00PM, except the first Friday of each bi-week. The telephone number for Wednesday is (703) 560-0528.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael S. Lebentritt, can be reached on (571) 272-1873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ha Nguyen Primary Examiner 11- 18 - 05